DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 017 HE 014 678

AUTHOR Sussman, Herbert; And Others
TITLE The Future Is Partnership.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C. Urban College and University Network.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 8p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.
JOURNAL CIT Connections; v3 n5 Nov 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Articulation (Education); College Students; Community Colleges; Cooperative Programs; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Noncredit Courses; Nontraditional Education; Nontraditional Students; *School Community Relationship; *Shared Facilities; Social Change; State Colleges; Student Needs; Student Recruitment; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

Future considerations regarding new student clientele and cooperative arrangements among urban universities as they confront societal change are considered by six campus chief executives. Herbert M. Sussman mentions the San Francisco Community College District's noncredit program, which has a separate delivery system, and suggests that the future will require colleges to allow people to move in and out of the system as they mix work and retirement with education and training. James F. Gollattscheck proposes that partnerships between universities and community colleges must be built on mutual respect and a firm contract, and should help overcome stereotypes (e.g., the community college is where unprepared students go). Donald J. MacIntyre describes the arrangement between three institutions that exist on the same campus: the University of Colorado at Denver, which emphasizes graduate and professional education in several fields; the Community College of Denver, which emphasizes occupational and vocational education and transfer programs; and Metropolitan State, a four-year school that confers baccalaureate degrees. Alexander F. Schilt notes the importance of eliciting cooperation among private and public institutions, the corporate sector, and government. Dorothy Ann Kelly suggests that colleges and universities can and ought to continue to reach out to new audiences, and comments on the efforts of the College of New Rochelle in New York City. Arnold B. Grobman proposes that cooperative arrangements between an urban public university and the educational, cultural, and governmental institutions of the metropolitan region are possible because of the proximity of the cooperating participants. (SW)

ED211017

NOVEMBER 1981 VOLUME 3, NO. 5 URBAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY NETWORK

CONNECTIONS

THE FUTURE IS PARTNERSHIP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 014 678

November 1981 Volume 3, No. 4 5 Urban College and University Network

connections

Connections is the bulletin of the Urban College and University Network. Network participants are two- and four-year colleges and universities, both public and private, located in major U.S. urban centers. The Network provides a means for sharing information on successful or promising efforts by colleges and universities in the city to serve the educational needs of city residents, particularly poor, minority, and disadvantaged persons, and about the more persistent problems encountered by these colleges and universities as they provide education in the city.

The Urban College and University Network is a project of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in cooperation with the American Council on Education, American Association of University and Junior Colleges, Association of American Colleges, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Committee on Urban Program Universities, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The project is made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

In a Changing Society

The role of college has always been a schizophrenic one. As a product of the society, it must respond to the needs of society, and yet it cannot ignore the leadership role of preparing students for a future that continues to be more and more unpredictable. The agenda of the urban college then becomes one of considering the future needs of the society as well as the personal needs and values of individuals. All predictions about the future are extremely precarious, and since human behavior is not subject to straight-line projection, most of our thoughts about the future can be only tentative. There are, nevertheless, some general indications that may help in guiding us.

As we become less a blue collar society and become an almost totally white collar society, the skills required by mainstream America continue to change drastically. There seems to be little question that American workers are developing into a management-information force, replacing a mass production force. Mass education designed for industrial society will be inadequate for the post-industrial society because knowledge and skills required for a management-information society will differ.

Yet society continues to encourage and accommodate functional illiteracy. Even our cash registers ring up the amount of change to be returned to customers as the supermarket clerk almost mindlessly pushes buttons on his/her microcomputer, and we shall continue to design machines that can be operated with a minimum of mental effort. Are we headed toward a society that will segregate us into a class of managers and a class of the managed? Within that society will there be a permanent underclass supported by the larger society?

We shall always have a stratified society, but the challenge to urban colleges is whether or not by our own structure we become a segregating vehicle. Our business must be to allow people to grow and develop to the extent of their desire and capacity. While few will disagree with this statement, there will be some wide difference of opinion about reaching the goal. Many articles in previous issues of *Connections* reveal a variety of methods for approaching some of the problems in urban education, but there is no panacea, and the Holy Grail will continue to elude us. Our agenda is to adapt to our changing environment without discarding the lasting values that have been developed over the years.

The drastic demographic changes in urban populations over the last two decades should surprise no one. The attendant shifts in student populations, nevertheless, continue to send us scurrying in all directions for a universal solution. The ethnic shifts, the entry and reentry of women, the volatile economy, the clashing of values, and the variety of lifestyles all hasten the shifting of the sand under our feet. Add to all of this the general decline of academic skills of high school students, and it is a wonder that we do as well as we are doing in many colleges and universities.

While we have hardly caught up with our contemporary scene, we have the challenge of anticipating the future in which our students will live and help shape. Now the need to shorten the time lag between the Academy and society has become critical.

There is ample evidence that as we attract older and more part-time students the need for academic credit and degrees will diminish and be replaced by the need to learn, know, and acquire skills. Usually labeled as "continuing education," "community services," or "adult education," these types of programs will require more of our attention.

For example, in addition to structured credit and degree programs at the City College of San Francisco, the Community College District has developed a separate delivery system for non-credit programs that we call the Centers Division. Our latest venture is the building of a Downtown

THE FUTURE IS PARTNER-SHIP...

What lies ahead for urban colleges and universities? In this issue campus chief executives reflect upon some important considerations as urban higher education confronts societal change. Building lasting partnerships with the city, its people, and its enterprises emerges as a priority agenda item.

Herbert M. Sussman, a member of the Advisory Panel of the Urban College and University Network, is Chancellor of the San Francisco Community College District.

James F. Gollattscheck is President of Valencia Community College in Orlando, Florida.

Center committed to the people that work in San Francisco's large commercial district. The open-entry, open-exit classes carry no academic credit. The only motivation for the students is the desire to learn. Our certificates document acquired skills for job entry or upgrading. A large part of the business program is modular with entry-level testing and completion testing. Although classes are scheduled, students can attend at any time on a space-available basis. Faculty members function as *learning managers* rather than traditional teachers. The Center operates from 8:00 AM to 11:00 PM, and in the evening the District rents some space to San Francisco State University for non-competitive upper-division courses. The attempt is to establish a vertical educational facility in the midst of the business district to serve the needs of people in their work lives and as their lives change.

The future will require that we tailor our educational offerings. We will have to allow people to move in and out of the system as they mix work and retirement with education and training. Remaining adaptable and flexible to accommodate the changing needs of a changing population, while avoiding chaos and maintaining standards, is our agenda for the future.

Herbert Sussman ■

Between Urban Colleges and Universities

The following comments are taken from the remarks of campus chief executive officers during a session of the 1981 National Conference of the American Association for Higher Education. The session, "Promising Frontiers for City Colleges and Universities: Mutual Understanding of Purposes and Contributions," was chaired by Daniel H. Perlman, president of Suffolk University in Boston.

The session was co-sponsored by Association of American Colleges, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

JAMES GOLLATTSCHECK

When I think about partnerships in the urban arena, I wonder what is different between this kind of cooperation and any other type of interinstitutional cooperation. I think the difference is that in an urban area cooperation takes on added significance. In cities, institutions are more often than not serving the same general student population and are interested in the same kinds of problems. Service is rendered not to a region but to a group of people who live nearby.

Educators must face the fact that when we talk about two-year institutions and four-year institutions we deal with stereotypes. Chief executive officers and staff tend to share these stereotypes. The university depicts the community college as a place where unprepared students go, with a weak faculty concerned only with teaching. Therefore, students leave with associate degrees but come to the university unprepared. The community college characterizes the university as a place where freshman students are herded in groups of 300, are all taught by graduate teaching assistants, and never see a professor until the junior or senior year.

Partnerships between universities and community colleges must be built on mutual respect and a firm contract. Many of us think that we need to have an agreement that will allow lower-division students to transfer into the upper-division institutions. In this way, community colleges will admit entry students and universities will take over the job of education after preparatory work has been completed.

In the occupational field we serve the same business and industry professions. A joint advisory committee that helps plan both sides of the degree program is needed so that we can work together from the very beginning, and there ought to be representatives of the other institution on each institution's in-house advisory committee. This type of planning would make it easier for community agencies to work with us and communicate their needs for personnel and training.

A third form of partnership concerns cooperation in continuing education and community service. In this case, planning and coordination are necessary because this field is so crowded, especially in urban areas. The key questions are: Who does what, best? How can we best work together? An excellent example can be found in the health professions: the physician will have her/his continuing education needs met by the university; the licensed practical nurse will be best served by a community college; and the registered nurse could go to either institution depending on the type of training desired.

Another very important and misunderstood area is staff development. Very often we think of the university as providing staff development for the community college or four-year college. People who are specially trained to teach in a community college are needed desperately. Yet the need is not for a Ph.D. in Shakespeare, but rather for someone who can teach freshman composition. The community college can be both advisor and laboratory by working with the university to develop such a training program.

"Partnerships between universities and community colleges must be built on mutual respect and a firm contract."

In conclusion, I believe that in the urban area we have no choice but to begin cooperating. I think incentives are beginning to be provided. For example, in Florida last year an omnibus higher education bill was passed which provides matching funding to help staff consortia. Such incentives will certainly spur consortia planning in urban areas. It is true that this kind of cooperation is not easy and has a great many problems. Yet the problems can be worked out if there is desire, mutual respect, and recognition of the benefits that accrue to all involved.

DONALD MacINTYRE

My institution, Metropolitan State College, is one of three institutions that make up Auraria Higher Education Center, including the University of Colorado at Denver and the Community College of Denver at Auraria. The unique feature of this center is that we share common facilities. We have one library, one physical education facility, one student center. Cooperation is not a theory with us, it is a daily way of life.

Donald J. MacIntyre, formerly President of Metropolitan State College in Denver, is President of Canada College, San Jose Community College District, in Redwood City, California.

All three of us define ourselves as urban institutions. The University of Colorado at Denver, which is a branch of the University of Colorado, obviously has special emphasis on graduate and professional education in such areas as environmental design, public affairs, engineering, and business at the MBA level. The Community College of Denver is an open-door institution, with an emphasis on occupational and vocational education and transfer programs at the associate level. Metropolitan State is an open admission, four-year institution which by statute is allowed to confer only baccalaureate degrees.

All three institutions exist on the same campus, trying to meet the needs of a growing urban area. By and large the mix of programs is complementary. For example, the university offers engineering, Metropolitan State offers engineering technology, and the community college offers the engineering technician programs. The Auraria Higher Education Board is the proprietor, landlord, and janitor of the campus. It controls all the physical facilities for all three institutions.

The impetus for the partnership of these three institutions emerged when each wanted its own campus. The response of the legislature was to put all three together and build one new campus. Initially, the center was viewed as a tremendous cost-saving effort for the State of Colorado—and it is. But soon after the institutions came together on the same campus, members of the State's joint budget committee began to raise questions about duplication. "Why is it you have two history or two philosophy departments?" The result was a mandate from the State of Colorado for one philosophy, one physics, and one modern language department. Next the legislators asked, "Why are there two admissions officers and two registrars?" By State mandate a common registration system was ordered for Metropolitan State College and University of Colorado at Denver.

Yet there are problems. It is an administrative nightmare not designed for "administrative" types. There are four governing boards involved on the same campus. Anytime anything has to be done a common calendar for three institutions has to be agreed upon.

There are also artificial barriers to partnerships. The business school at Metropolitan State College is reluctant to accept a common course from the Community College which is in the next building. The University of Colorado at Denver business school, which is across the creek, is unwilling to accept Metropolitan State's economics courses for its business degree.

Our faculty believes that the University faculty has a disdainful attitude toward them. We have an agreement that my faculty can apply for graduate faculty status at the University as part of our cooperative arrangement. Today, no one has achieved graduate faculty status at the University. When you have two faculties or three faculties living side by side, you also have the problem of different treatment. My faculty are two to an office, the University's are one to an office. But these are only irksome problems compared to the advantages that have been achieved by cooperating.

A student has great scheduling flexibility. She or he can receive an A.A. degree, a B.A., or a Ph.D. without leaving the Auraria campus. The combined library is strong, and the media center is outstanding. Our faculties are actually talking to each other. That was hard! When we put our two philosophy departments together, I was told by the chairman of my department that the world had come to an end. He now is the major advocate of cooperation. They really have learned that through working together the curricula in philosophy and physics have been strengthened. There is no doubt in my mind that Denver is better served by the fact that we are three cooperating institutions. Now we can sit down together as an institution and talk about neighborhood development, make joint proposals, and work with the Denver Housing Authority.

"Cooperation is not a theory with us, it is a daily way of life."

Is this cooperative venture cost effective? You bet! We have the lowest cost of instruction per student on campus of all three higher education sectors in the State of Colorado. We have fifty square feet per student, compared to 150 square feet per student state-wide. Every single index indicates we give Coloradans a real bang for their buck, and that is what they want.

ALEXANDER SCHILT

Is cooperation a step toward improved educational quality? I think that depends on the extent to which the institution plans for such cooperation to occur. Our strategy at Houston, and earlier at Indiana, was a simple one, and it was applied to private and public institutions, the corporate sector, as well as city, state, and county government. In all instances, we began by demonstrating an interest in another entity as a potential participant in the cooperative process. This approach is powerful because there is probably nothing more pleasing than having someone come to you wanting to know about you, your program, and your organization. I remember one evening when I was having dinner with an Indiana newspaper editor who was several years my senior. He confided toward the end of the evening that I was the first college president with whom he had ever dined. We applied the same approach of demonstrating interest with minority groups in the city of Houston, and they have responded in much the same way.

Demonstrated interest leads to institutional friendship; institutional friendship leads to opportunities for partnership; and finally, as a result of the opportunities for partnership, there are the achievements that prompted the initial contact.

The specifics of what the university hopes to achieve as a result of the partnership vary from one constituency to another. With business and industry the university may be seeking money for endowed chairs and special projects. With government it is seeking good will and participation on joint projects. With the public it is seeking students. With community organizations it is trying to create opportunities for minority groups and others that have long been excluded from higher education. With other education enterprises, the university is seeking enhancement of curricular and degree opportunities for students and opportunities for the faculty that lead to further development and renewal.

Is cooperation important? Cooperation certainly leads to better cultivation and understanding of important constituencies as the university becomes more knowledgeable about its multiple constituencies. Further, cooperation has always been a vehicle for recruiting students and has never failed to make substantial contributions to the institution. And finally, partnership is important because—at least in my experi-

Alexander F. Schilt is Chancellor of University of Houston Downtown College.

Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly, a member of the Advisory Panel of the Urban College and University Network, is President of the College of New Rochelle.

ence—it has always led to greater appreciation of the institution by all external constituents.

Cooperation will not occur unless it is a very high priority of the chief executive officer for at least one of the enterprises involved. It takes a greater commitment of time to find incentives that will cause people to want to cooperate than to coerce them to do so. There is a great difference between cooperating because it is part of the written mission of an institution and cooperating because it is the genuine spirit of the institution. It may be expressed as part of the mission as "public service" or "extension" or "outreach". Yet many institutions are terribly ineffective as they try to reach out to establish cooperative arrangements.

"Demonstrated interest leads to institutional friendship; institutional friendship leads to opportunities for partnership ..."

The concept of "territory" can be applied very accurately to cooperation. In order to cooperate successfully, individuals—this particularly applies to chief officers and senior administrative officers and deans—must move beyond the point of needing to control the program. We should ask how can we bring the highest quality programs to the community. If we approach partnership in this way, rather than looking at it in terms of who owns the program, then the opportunities are limitless.

Cooperation is possible for campus chief executive officers because educational results can be achieved in non-traditional ways. However, partnership holds no promise of an array of fine buildings or new degree programs or larger faculties.

It is terribly important that we look for opportunities to cooperate and to do so on our own prior to the time that state coordinating boards or commissions for higher education come to us and tell us how, when, and with whom to create partnerships.

An audiotape of the session proceedings of (IAAHE-50) "Frontiers for City Colleges and Universities," American Association for Higher Education, 1981 Conference, can be obtained from Mobiltape Company, Inc., 1741 Gardena Avenue, Glendale, California 91204. ■

With Today's Students

Clara Cooper graduated from college without having to leave her home in the heart of the South Bronx. Ms. Cooper, a community worker and mother, was able to earn her Bachelor of Arts degree because higher education had begun to respond to and recognize the educational needs of urban adults.

In 1979, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York approved the establishment of a branch campus of the College of New Rochelle's School of New Resources in the South Bronx. This approval marked the opening of the first and only four-year degree program in the South Bronx community; it also marked, quite vividly, a commitment made by the College of New Rochelle to provide a quality liberal arts education in areas in which working adults would find their education more accessible. The South Bronx community, like so many others in this country, must depend on its citizens to lead it into a future which will be productive, meaningful, and self-conscious and which will include not only the right but the reality of higher education for all of its residents.

The reasons for the growth of interest on the part of urban adults in higher education are diverse, as are the adult students themselves. Many workers engage in several types of work in the course of their working lives, and this presents a need for the adult to plan for multiple careers. In addition to this need, a new consciousness and concept of learning as a life-long process has begun to take root.

The College of New Rochelle, which was founded in 1904 by the Ursuline Order of Nuns, has extended its mission as a liberal arts college to encompass the needs of a new clientele. Through its School of New Resources, established in 1972, the College of New Rochelle enrolls over 3,000 adult students. The School of New Resources bases its philosophy and program on the recognition that adults learn differently from younger students and bring to the classroom a rich set of life experiences that are uniquely valuable. New Resources students are mothers, fathers, clerks, paraprofessionals, New York City workers, active community volunteers, the unemployed, and the under-employed. They are the men and women who live and work in New York City and the surrounding counties. They are the people responsible for the future of this great urban center.

Higher education must, if it is to be realistic, place an extraordinary value on the future of adult education. With the "graying of America," educators face an entirely new series of financial, political, and curricular problems. This is attributed, in part, to the drastic shift in the demography of the United States that will soon define us as a nation of older people. The University of the State of New York has reported that 61.8% of the total full-time students in institutions of higher education in the State of New York are over twenty-two years of age. If finding and serving new constituencies is imperative for postsecondary education, it is equally important that older citizens be served educationally. Given the demographics of age and residency, we know that our cities contain huge numbers of adults who have not participated in higher education. For the most part, they must involve themselves in education if they are to be free to make the choices necessary in today's world and sustain the life of their communities.

"Colleges and universities... must reach . . . the urban adults who give so much of themselves to become partners."

The benefit to this country should be clear to all of us. Our urban areas are in desperate need of support. This should come not only from the public and private social agencies, but from the people themselves. If we believe that education provides a humanizing dimension to our lives, we must recognize that it should also prescribe an understanding of our lives, circumstances, and future. This understanding, coupled with the ability to undertake change and to have enthusiasm for change, will enable us to build better communities for all our people.

Colleges and universities can and ought to continue to reach out to new audiences. If they are to continue to be viable contributors to American society, they must reach more deeply into the urban areas and to the urban adults who give so much of themselves to become partners in our educational process. Dorothy Ann Kelly ■

Arnold B. Grobman, a member of the Advisory Panel of the Urban College and University Network, is Chancellor of the University of Missouri at St. Louis.

Among the City's Enterprises

Those who speak for public urban universities frequently compare their campuses with traditional non-urban residential institutions and sometimes find themselves explaining why their campuses differ from state universities located in small communities. The implication seems to be that the state university, located in a small community, is the appropriate model for emulation by the public urban university, and deviations from that model are regarded as deficiencies that need to be explained.

Probably several more decades will pass before it will be generally understood that the differences between the two kinds of institutions reflect their milieu and missions, that neither is better nor worse than the other, and that neither properly serves as the model for the other.

In fact, some of the differences between them suggest that urban public institutions are in a substantially more favorable position than their non-urban counterparts in the effective and efficient education of students. Among those differences favoring urban public colleges and universities are those that have their roots in the many advantages for cooperation with other agencies and institutions in a large metropolitan area. Such advantages are absent in the small communities, and compensatory steps taken by many non-urban universities often are less than equivalent.

Perhaps the most direct way for me to illustrate this proposition is to use examples from the institution with which I am associated. I recognize, of course, that other public urban universities have developed comparable programs and may have taken advantage of cooperative arrangements beyond the present efforts at the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL).

UMSL has a graduate student exchange program with Washington University and St. Louis University through which graduate students on any one of the campuses can register in low-enrollment courses on the other two campuses. This program reduces duplication of expensive low-enrollment graduate courses while enriching the educational opportunities for the graduate students at the three universities.

"Cooperative arrangements between an urban public university and the educational, cultural, and governmental institutions of the metropolitan region are possible only because of the proximity of the cooperating participants."

With Washington University, UMSL has been submitting joint proposals to federal agencies for grants to purchase specialized equipment for the use of both chemistry departments, and the success of such proposals seems to be greater than comparable individual institutional proposals.

A visual research program has been established among faculty members in the UMSL School of Optometry and faculty members in the Department of Ophthalmology in the Washington University Medical School. In a related development, there is a faculty exchange program among the St. Louis Eye Hospital, the Washington University and St. Louis University Ophthalmology Departments, and the UMSL School of Optometry.

Historians from St. Louis University, Washington University, and UMSL have formed an Institute for Reformation Studies located at a local Seminary that has a fine library.

Virtually all of the colleges and universities in the St. Louis metropolitan area are members of a voluntary organization, the Higher Education Center of St. Louis, which manages seven Educational Opportunity Centers scattered throughout the metropolitan region.

By simply showing his ID card, a student of any college or university in the St. Louis metropolitan region can use the library facilities of any of the other participating campuses.

UMSL has an off-campus, downtown location which it shares with St. Louis Community College at Forest Park, and UMSL offers a number of its extension courses at local high schools. Conversely, the campus facilities are used by local schools for junior science fairs, reading clinics, career counseling of high school students, teacher training centers, high school debate contests, school music festivals, biology nights for high school students, spelling bees, basketball tournaments, and many other activities.

UMSL has a dual enrollment program with some of the area high schools, and UMSL faculty members are developing pre-college curricula in history and economics that are being tested in local schools.

The Missouri Botanical Garden, located in St. Louis, has been labeling the trees on the UMSL campus, and the Garden's director is an adjunct professor at the University.

Officers of Laumeier Sculpture Park, a unique St. Louis institution, have placed two pieces of modern statuary on campus as a long-term loan.

Several members of the St. Louis Symphony have formed a chamber music orchestra, Kammergild, and that orchestra is headquartered on the UMSL campus in what may be an arrangement unique in this country—an orchestra-in-residence on a university campus. The orchestra offers two concerts on the campus each year, and advanced music students may attend the rehearsals.

UMSL has a contract with the City of St. Louis, the Technical Assistance Program, under which faculty members serve as short-term consultants to specific city departments. Through this program, which is jointly funded by the City of St. Louis and UMSL, faculty members are selected

Connections is published by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Allan W. Ostar, President; Karl B. Smith, Network Coordinator; Mitchell S. Brooks, Program Associate; Darcel Nesmith Ball, Senior Administrative Assistant; Thomas W. Kelly, Editorial Consultant; John Lester, Program Consultant. Offices are located at One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 293-7070.

Network Advisory Panel: Milton Bins, Senior Associate for Policy and Program Development with the Council of the Great City Schools; Samuel Concessor, Staff Vice President of the RCA Corporation; Michael Goldstein, Attorney; Arnold Grobman, Chancellor of the University of Missouri at St. Louis; Carl Holman, President of The National Urban Coalition; Sister Dorothy Ann Kelly, President of the College of New Rochelle; Lucille Maurer, Delegate to the Maryland State Legislature; Ernest Morial, Mayor of the City of New Orleans; Daniel Perlman, President of Suffolk University in Boston; Herbert Sussman, Councellor of the San Francisco Community College District; Jose Vazquez, Professor of Education at Hunter College in New York City; and Ronald Williams, President of Northeastern Illinois University in Chicago.

by a joint City-University committee to aid city departments.

The Technical Assistance Program not only provides the City with expert advice from specialists familiar with the City at a far more reasonable cost than such services could be provided by out-of-town consultants, but also it gives UMSL faculty members opportunities to participate in "real world" activities parallel to their academic interests, and that, in turn, benefits the students at the University.

These cooperative arrangements between an urban public university and the educational, cultural, and governmental institutions of the metropolitan region are possible only because of the proximity of the cooperating participants. Such cooperation translates into the enrichment of learning opportunities and very significant savings of scarce resources.

Urban universities have other advantages including the availability to students of a wide variety of internship and employment opportunities and cultural resources such as major museums, professional plays, art galleries, symphony orchestras, and opera theatres. These advantages can only be approximated on a university campus located some distance from a major metropolitan center.

The tremendous opportunities for cooperation with institutions and agencies in the metropolitan area place the public urban university in a most favorable position to provide high quality education and community service. Arnold Grobman ■

making connections

This edition completes the series of ten *Connections* published with the assistance of the Ford Foundation. By sponsoring this project the cooperating national higher education associations and the Foundation have provided an unusual opportunity for information sharing by institutions that provide higher education in the city for its residents.

We emphasized in our reporting successful, or promising, efforts to accommodate the diverse life circumstances and learning needs of urban residents, many of whom have not been served well by the educational system. We began by looking at efforts to reach out to new student populations, to help academically unprepared students succeed in higher education, and to tap the resources of the city to help students combine work experience with classroom learning. Later issues of *Connections* focused upon the problems of establishing cooperation among urban institutions, responding to the increasing diversity of students, coping with the fiscal crisis, and improving the working environment on campus.

Essays and program reports spotlighted a variety of issues and approaches. By using as many examples as possible, we tried to show the multiple facets of urban higher education. However, it should surprise no one to learn that we have discovered no paradigms of higher education *in and of* the city. Urban colleges and universities, like the cities, are not tidy enterprises.

This seems an appropriate time to acknowledge once again the contributions to the success of this information-sharing project made by a great many individuals on urban college and university campuses across the country. Administrators, faculty members, and students have given freely of time as they completed our questionnaires, responded to our telephone interviews, or participated in our visits to campus.

We want to recognize two individuals whose names do not appear in the standing credits. Lynn Barnett, Assistant Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education selected and annotated items that appeared in "ERIC as a Resource." Marlise Mason Longbottom, consulting design director, helped us to make *Connections* a high quality, eye-pleasing medium for sharing information.

We also wish to express our appreciation of the guidance provided by members of the Network advisory panel and senior staff members of the cooperating higher education associations. Finally, we wish to acknowledge with gratitude the role of the Ford Foundation in making this experiment with information sharing possible.

KBS ■

A limited supply of back issues of Connections is available for distribution without charge. For information and order forms contact: AASCU Publications, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.